

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11, and have canceled claims 12-20. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite (as noted above, claim 20 has been canceled herein). In response to the Examiner's indefiniteness concerns, Applicants have amended claim 11 to recite "a reception module that receives a radio signal transmitted from a remote control unit, in response to *operation of* one of Up, Down, Left, Right, and OK keys on said remote control unit" (emphasis added). Applicants have not amended the portion of claim 11 cited by the Examiner because that portion of the claim refers to the Up, Down, Left, Right, and OK *commands*, rather than the Up, Down, Left, Right, and OK keys. Applicants agree that it is appropriate to refer to operation of the keys, but respectfully submit that it would not be appropriate to refer to operation of the commands. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 now satisfies the definiteness requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and requests that the rejection of this claim thereunder be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Smith* (U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2001/0050684 A1) in view of *West et al.* (ebook entitled "Sams Teach Yourself Macromedia Fireworks MX in 24 Hours"). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Smith* in view of *West et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in independent claim 1, as amended herein.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to specify that the second manipulation menu display field is arranged at a location “opposite to” the predetermined location on the periphery of the viewer display field on the display unit. In the technique of the claimed subject matter, as both the first and second manipulation menu displays commonly include the viewer display field, when the first display command which corresponds to the first display manipulation window is input during display of the second display manipulation window, the first manipulation menu display is slid aside and faded out from the display unit, and the second manipulation menu display appears at a position on the periphery of the viewer display field, which position is opposite to where the first manipulation menu display was, while the viewer field still remains on the display on the display unit.

The *Smith* reference discloses in Figures 14 and 15 that three tabs (1404, 1406, and 1408) respectively correspond to each command menu, and when one of the tabs is clicked on during display of the other command menu, the other command menu disappears from the screen and the new command menu which corresponds to the currently clicked tab appears *at the same location where the command menu that has disappeared was formerly located*. The *Smith* reference does not disclose or suggest a technique in which the previous command menu slides at the time it disappears.

The *West et al.* reference merely discloses that a user can choose whether a menu is on the screen or not by clicking a button.

In view of the foregoing, the combination of the *Smith* and *West et al.* references would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in claim 1, as amended herein.

Independent claim 10 defines a user interface display method that includes method operations that generally correspond to the functionality of the user interface device defined

in claim 1, as amended herein. As such, the arguments set forth above regarding claim 1 also apply to claim 10.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 10, as presented herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Smith* in view of *West et al.* Claims 3-9, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Smith* in view of *West et al.* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Smith* in view of *Wilcox et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,678,891 B1) (as noted above, Applicants have canceled claims 12-20 herein). Applicants have amended claim 11 so that this claim now depends from claim 1. The *Wilcox et al.* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Smith* reference relative to the subject matter defined in amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 11, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Smith* in view of *Wilcox et al.* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 2 as being unpatentable over *Smith* in view of *West et al.* and further in view of *Usal* (the article entitled "Sliding Menu"). Claim 2 depends from claim 1. The *Usal* reference discloses that when one of the small buttons, all of which respectively correspond to the large clips, is clicked by a user, a shown clip is slid aside and completely faded out from the screen, and the new clip which corresponds to the currently clicked button appears *at the same position where the previous clip was formerly located*. The *Usal* reference does not disclose or suggest a technique in which the new clip appears at a position different from where the previous clip was formerly located. As such, the *Usal* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the *Smith* and *West et al.* references relative to the subject matter defined in amended claim 1. Accordingly, claim 2 is

patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Smith* in view of *West et al.* and further in view of *Usal* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Smith* in view of *Wilcox* and further in view of *West et al.* In light of the cancellation of claims 12-20 herein, Applicants submit that the obviousness rejection of claims 12-18 is moot.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-11, as presented herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ITECP016).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920